



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

212

CRR-1704-2010

Date of Decision: 20.05.2024

Yogayata Thapar

.... Petitioner

Versus

Pompy Thapar

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - None.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The matter pertains to the year 2010.

Perusal of the order sheets reveals that notice in the application (CRM-31402-2010) for condonation of delay of 280 days in filing the present revision was issued by a co-ordinate Bench of this court on 18.08.2010. Thereafter, the case was listed for hearing 12 times i.e. on 15.09.2010, 01.12.2010, 07.02.2011, 29.07.2011, 22.11.2011, 22.12.2011, 18.04.2022, 08.05.2012, 23.07.2012, 28.08.2012, 12.09.2012, 30.10.2012 and the same was repeatedly adjourned either on account of non-appearance on behalf of either of the parties; and mostly at the request of learned counsel for the respondent for filing reply to the aforesaid application. Ultimately, the aforesaid application was allowed vide order dated 14.12.2012, passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court and delay of 280 days in filing the present was ordered to be condoned.



Since then, the matter was listed for hearing 09 times i.e. on 29.01.2013, 19.03.2013, 15.05.2013, 16.01.2014, 22.04.2014, 02.09.2014, 10.11.2014, 22.01.2015 and 25.05.2015 and again the same was adjourned at the request of learned counsel for the parties on one pretext or the other.

On 04.09.2015, when this matter was listed for hearing before a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, following order was passed:-

“Repeated adjournments have been sought in the case. Today again similar request has been made. Adjourned since die.”

On the last date of hearing i.e. 12.10.2023, the matter was adjourned for today i.e. 20.05.2024, on account of non-appearance on behalf of petitioner.

Today, again the petitioner has gone un-represented, despite the case having been called twice. There is no justification to further adjourn the case. From the facts noticed above, it can safely be presumed that the petitioner or her counsel is not interested in pursuing the instant revision. Thus, this Court is left with no other option except to dismiss the instant revision petition for non-prosecution.

Ordered accordingly.

20.05.2024
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No